

Appendix B

Gender Impact Rating (GIR) and Rankings data

Stage of Training	Median Gender Impact Rating
FY2	3
CT1	3
CT2	2

Table 1.1. Gender Impact Rating (GIR) at foundation year 2 (FY2), core training 1 (CT1) and core training 2 (CT2) stages of medical training. CT2 trainees had a median GIR of 2, whereas CT1 and FY2 trainees both had higher GIR of 3.

Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test Summary

Total N	100
Test Statistic	1.657 ^{a,b}
Degree Of Freedom	2
Asymptotic Sig.(2-sided test)	.437

- a. The test statistic is adjusted for ties.
- b. Multiple comparisons are not performed because the overall test does not show significant differences across samples.

Table 1.2. Table showing insignificant results of Kruskal Wallis Significance Test on median gender impact rating for pre- and post-core training, showing an asymptotic significance (p-value) of 0.437 which was not significant ($\alpha = 0.05$).

Ethnicity	Median Gender Impact Rating
White British/Irish/Other	2
Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic	3

Table 2.1. A comparison of the Gender Impact Rating (GIR) between White/British/Other participants and Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) participants. GIR of White/British/Other participants skewed towards lower values with the median rating of 2 which is lower than the BAME median of 3. Difference in GIR of BAME and White/British/Other respondents was not statistically significant.

Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test Summary

Total N	97
Test Statistic	3.025 ^{a,b}
Degree Of Freedom	1
Asymptotic Sig.(2-sided test)	.082

- a. The test statistic is adjusted for ties.
- b. Multiple comparisons are not performed because the overall test does not show significant differences across samples.

Table 2.2. Table showing insignificant results from Kruskal-Wallis Test on Gender Impact Ratings of Black, Asian Minority Ethnic and White/British/Other respondents, showing an asymptotic significance (p-value) of 0.082 which was not significant ($\alpha = 0.05$).

Top ranked motivator * Marital status Crosstabulation

Top ranked motivator		Marital status				Total	
		Unmarried		Married/Civil Partnership		N	%
		N	%	N	%		
Professional support in the specialties		15 ^a	19.2%	11 ^b	57.9%	26	26.8%
Social support system		10 ^a	12.8%	1 ^a	5.3%	11	11.3%
Positive changes to the organisational culture		4 ^a	5.1%	0 ^a	0.0%	4	4.1%
Early exposure to surgical specialties		37 ^a	47.4%	7 ^a	36.8%	44	45.4%
Income		1 ^a	1.3%	0 ^a	0.0%	1	1.0%
Career progression is well defined		11 ^a	14.1%	0 ^a	0.0%	11	11.3%
Total		78	100.0%	19	100.0%	97	100.0%

Each subscript letter denotes a subset of Marital status categories whose column proportions do not differ significantly from each other at the .05 level.

Table 3.1. Cross Tabulation of top ranked motivators against married and unmarried participants showing the significant ($\alpha = 0.05$) difference in the proportion of top ranking professional support between married and unmarried individuals.

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.566 ^a	5	.019
Likelihood Ratio	15.273	5	.009
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.870	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	97		

a. 6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .20.

Table 3.2. Results of Pearson's Chi-Square test of the most influential motivators against marital status showing a significant difference between the two groups ($p=0.019$).